

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-6 and rejected same. With this paper, various of the claims are changed, none are canceled, and two new claims are added, so that claims 1-8 are now pending.

Comments on changes to the previously presented claims

Various of the previously presented claims are changed in ways believed related only to matters of form. In particular, "characterized by/in that" is replaced with "comprising/wherein." Applicant respectfully submits that such changes are permissible per MPEP § 2111.03 (the transitional term "comprising" is synonymous with "characterized by"). Also, reference numerals/labels are removed from the claims, which change does not affect the scope of the claims per MPEP § 608.01(m) (the use of reference characters is considered as having no effect on the scope of the claims). Further, the claims are amended to remove "step of" language.

Drawing amendment

At paragraph 1 of the Office action, a drawing amendment is required because, according to the Office action, Fig. 1 incorrectly labels Documentum ACL database (shown as "Dctm ACL data") as 19 instead of 10, by which it is referred to in the specification. Based on a phone call to the Examiner on 12 July 2006, applicant understands the Office to mean that the description refers to Documentum ACL database 19, whereas it should refer to Documentum ACL database 10. With this paper, the description is changed accordingly.

Rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph

At page 3 of the Office action, claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for reciting "possibly differing" on the ground that such a recitation renders the claims

indefinite. With this paper, claims 2 and 4 are changed in a way believed sufficient to overcome the rejections.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC §101

At page 3 of the Office action, claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC §101 because it fails to provide a "useful, concrete and tangible result." [Emphasis by the Examiner.] The Office explains that what is claimed "does not produce ... a certain level of 'real world' value."

With this paper, claim 1 is changed to recite that the site management application updates is usable in changing data stored in the site structure database, and thus the invention as in claim 1 is useful in changing the physical state of a real world object, i.e. the physical state of the media in which are encoded the information in the site structure database.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 USC §101 of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

At page 4 of the Office action, claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Judd et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,016,963).

Of the rejected claims, only claims 1 and 3 are independent. Both recite (as amended) a site structure database, containing data indicating how accessible content is organized at a site accessible as a wireless access protocol portal by terminals of different types, wherein the data includes information indicating relationships between pages of accessible content and includes information indicating for each page and for each terminal type a template according to which content for the page is to be

provided. The site structure database therefore indicates different templates for displaying respective pages for respective terminal types.

Applicant respectfully submits that Judd discloses no such database. Judd discloses instead "transforming" content according to a best fit. As explained at the Abstract, Judd discloses a process in which "content and information ... are transformed from one format, a source format, to a format that is compatible with [a] requesting device." [Emphasis added.] More specifically, as explained at col. 11, line 25, to col. 12, line 16,, Judd discloses a process by which content requested by a client device is transformed so as to be suitable for display by the client device, beginning with a client identification, determination and request parsing:

Once the variables and their values [apparently identifying specific content the client is request, per col. 11, line 14] have been identified, the server engine 200 performs request parsing 310. One aspect of the request parsing process 310 is to perform a "best fit" analysis by evaluating the variables against an existing "best fit matrix" in order to derive a content category. The best fit matrix is simply a single to multidimensional matrix that receives one or more variables as an input and provides a "best fit" template or profile based on the variables. ... [Emphasis added.]

The content category is utilized by the server ... to determine a "best fit" method or profile for ... sending the correct image, video, text, template, and markup language ... that optimizes display and performance on the client device If the system is unable to determine a "best fit" profile from existing content categories and the client variables, then a best fit value (lowest common denominator fit) is determined and used until enough information related to each of the above variables can be collected. [Emphasis added.]

...

Thus, during the client identification, determination and parsing process, the server engine 200 extracts information from a content request 307 from a client device 305, utilizes existing information about the client device 305 and/or a user of the client device, and derives information from other sources in an attempt to identify (a) what content to obtain for the client device 305 in response

to the content request 307 and (b) how to deliver the content to the client device 305.

In all of this, there is no teaching of a site structure database containing data indicating how accessible content is organized at a site accessible as a wireless access protocol portal by terminals of different types, wherein the data includes information indicating relationships between pages of accessible content and includes information indicating for each page and for each of the different terminal types a template according to which content for the page is to be provided, as required by claim 1. There is a teaching of the use determining a "content category" using a "single to multidimensional matrix" (called the "best fit matrix"), and then a teaching of using the content category so determined to provide a "best fit" method or profile (which, from col. 11, line 57, requires not only the content category, but also "the client variables" and it is not clear if these are user preferences or client device parameters), but there is no teaching of anything like the site structure database of claim 1. In fact, there is no teaching whatsoever of how to determine the best fit method or profile; there is only a teaching that the content category (at least) is used in determining the best fit method or profile.

Next, at col. 12, line 17, to col. 12, line ..., Judd discloses the next stage in the process of providing content, a stage called content storage and retrieval:

Content Storage and Retrieval. The server engine 200 maintains a meta-database 320 (also referred to as a linker database) that contains information about the content resources 330 that are indexed by the server engine 200.

Typically, the linker database 320 does not store the actual content, but rather stores information about how (resource retrieval API 322) and where (content resource location 324) to obtain the content. Advantageously, the use of a linker database 320 allows the number and amount of content resources 330 available to the server engine 200 to be virtually limitless.

...

Thus, during the content storage and retrieval process, the server engine 200 utilizes the information obtained during the client identification, determination and parsing process, as well as information contained in the linker database 320 to obtain the content requested in the content request 307, as well as additional information regarding the content. Based on the client variables, the server engine 200 may seek out and obtain content that is optimally suited for the client device 305. Advantageously, this aspect of the present invention helps to minimize processing that is required in the transformation of the content. The content, along with any other necessary information is then provided to the inbound content transformer 115.

Thus, the content to be provided is retrieved without regard to the terminal type for which it is intended. Applicant notes that the "client variables" may be taken into account, but these are believed to be user preferences, not client device parameters, and further, how they are taken into account is not disclosed. So there is still no teaching or suggestion of a site structure database as in claim 1.

Finally, at col. 13, beginning line 9, Judd discloses the transformation process:

Transformation Packaging and Delivery Process. During the transformation, packaging and delivery process, the server engine 200 transforms the content to a format suitable for the client device 305, and then packages and delivers the transformed content to the client device 305.

The content identified in the content request 307 and retrieved from one or more content resources 330 is, based on the "best fit" content category, transformed to a format that is suitable for the client device 305. In the embodiments described in conjunction with FIG. 1, this process may be accomplished by transforming the source content to an interim format 120 and then based on the "best fit" template transforming the content into a destination format 130, or the source content can be directly transformed from the source format 110 to the destination format 130 based on the "best fit" template. [Emphasis added.]

... [In some embodiments] the server engine 200 uses business rules and the "best fit" content category derived during the client identification, determination and parsing process to select [an] appropriate SGML format for the client device 305. Other engines and engine variants may also be used or developed and the present invention anticipates such development.

The content at this point has been transformed "to a format suitable for the client device" (as opposed to being according to a user preferences profile). It is clear that the transformation process has been completed by this point in the overall process, because Judd next discloses what happens next, "once the content has been transformed" (at col. 13, line 38). In all of this, culminating in the transformation, there is still no teaching of the use of a site structure database containing data indicating relationships between pages of accessible content and indicating for each page and for each of the different terminal types a template according to which content for the page is to be provided, as required by claim 1. Instead, there is an ambiguous reference to the use of a "best fit" content category for transforming content to a format that is suitable for a client device.

Judd then goes on to explain what happens next, after the content transformation has been completed. The statements made are confusing in view of the clear statement that the content transformation has already been performed by this stage in the process.

Once the content has been transformed, the server engine 200 "wraps" or "overlays" the content with an appropriate template. Once again, based on the "best fit" analysis and the "best fit" content category, the server engine 200 determines a proper set of templates and template parameters for displaying the content and merges the transformed content into the proper template for delivery to the client device 305. The linker database 320, in addition to indexing content resources 330, also indexes a template database 340. The template database 340 may be a local database or a remotely located database accessible to the server engine 200 through the Internet or some other localized or global network. Based on the "best fit" analysis, the location 326 of the "best fit" template can be extracted from the linker database 320 and used to access the "best fit" template from the template database 340.

So in summary, Judd discloses a "transformation" using a "best fit" method or profile to adapt the content to a terminal type, followed by a process in which the content server "wraps" or

"overlays" the content with a set of templates, merging the "transformed content" into the proper template for delivery to the client device. Whatever this wrapping/overlaying is, the content by this point in the process has already been transformed to "a format suitable for the client device," and so the wrapping/overlaying process is believed irrelevant to the invention as in claim 1. The site structure database provides information indicating the templates to use to provide content pages in a form appropriate to a terminal type. This enables the same function as accomplished by the "transformation" disclosed by Judd, i.e. the site structure database allows providing content in "a format suitable for the client device," but without having to perform any kind of "transformation."

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §102 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

19 July 2006

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224


James A. Retter
Registration No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955